

REMARKS

The Office Action of January 30, 2006 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 1-32 are currently pending. Claims 30 and 31 were previously withdrawn. Claims 1, 28, and 32 are rejected. Claims 2-26 and 29 are objected to. Claim 27 is allowed. Claims 9 and 29 are currently amended. No new matter has been introduced into the application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 27 is allowed. Applicants respectfully submit that additional the remaining pending claims are allowable in light of the amendments and comments provided below.

Claim Objections

Claims 2-26 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 29, Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 29 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have amended claim 29 to include all of the limitations of sole base claim 28. Thus, claim 29 is now in condition for allowance and notification of the same is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 28, and 32 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Sullivan, U.S. Patent No. 5,953,528.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action's contention that Sullivan teaches every feature of claims 1, 28, and 32.

Sullivan discloses a system 10 for registering a knowledge object 22 (stored in a client 14) at a server 12. The server 12 stores trust stamps 46 in a trust stamp database 44 and envelopes 50 in an envelope database 48. Trust stamps 46 are associated with knowledge objects and provide an indication of the level of trust for the knowledge object. The level of trust may

be indicated graphically, *e.g.* a gold knowledge object may be particularly reliable and may be useful for any business purpose within a corporate organization, whereas a silver knowledge object may be less reliable than a gold knowledge object (see column 5, line 66 to column 6, line 54). When another client 16, 18 wishes to use a knowledge object 22, they are informed as to the reliability of the knowledge object 22 by the associated trust stamp 46 when they view the knowledge object 22.

In Sullivan, in order to register a knowledge object 22, the client 14 must first place a request 38 at the server 12. A receive module 34 of the server 12 receives the request 38 and, using information contained within the request 38, determines its source (*i.e.* client 14). The server 12 then determines if the request 38 is a valid request using a validate module 40. This module verifies that the request form has been properly completed and may also determine if the server 12 authorizes requests for registration from this particular client 14. If there is a problem with the request 38 or the source of the request (*i.e.* client 14), the server 12 communicates this to the client 14. It should be noted that there is no disclosure that the server 12 authenticates the client 14 during this registration process or that it arbitrates whether authentication is required.

The server 12 in Sullivan then determines the level of trust for the knowledge object 22. The level of trust may be determined using the information contained in the request 38. Once a level of trust has been determined, the server 12 stores an associated envelope 50 in envelope database 48 and an associated trust stamp 46 in trust stamp database 44. The envelope 50 includes the information in the request 38 and a link to the associated trust stamp 46 (see fig. 2 for an example of an envelope 50).

In Sullivan, the server then constructs a pointer 56 and transmits it to the client 14 so that it may be added to the knowledge object 22. The pointer 56 contains information relating to the location of the envelope 50 and the stored trust stamp 46 associated with the knowledge object 22. Consequently, when a client 16, 18 views the knowledge object 22, the pointer 56 enables the server 12 to provide the trust stamp 46 associated with the knowledge object 22 to the client 16, 18.

Regarding claim 1, Sullivan does not disclose, teach, or suggest: "authentication means for authenticating a communicating device." Nor does Sullivan disclose, teach, or suggest that "if the arbitration requires an authentication of the communicating device, the access control means instructs the authentication means to authenticate the communicating device." Sullivan

merely discloses that if a client 14 places a request 38 to register a knowledge object 22, that the validate module 40 determines if it is authorized to register the knowledge object 22. No authentication of the source of request (i.e. client 14) is performed and the validate module 40 does not determine if authentication of the source of request is required during arbitration. Sullivan does not disclose, teach, or suggest authenticating a client 14 at any stage during the registration process. Nor would it be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to adopt the teaching of Sullivan to teach authenticating a client at any stage during the registration process. Moreover, Sullivan teaches away from the claimed features because, as mentioned in the background section of Sullivan, the knowledge workers using the knowledge objects are members of the same corporation and would have most likely been authenticated when logging onto the corporations system (i.e. prior to requesting registration of the knowledge object). Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Sullivan.

Regarding claims 28 and 32, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as those stated above regarding claim 1.

Regarding newly amended claim 9, that claim is allowable for at least the same reasons as those stated above regarding claim 1 because claim 9 has been amended to include all the features of claim 1.

Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration of rejected claims 1, 28, and 32 and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully requests consideration of newly amended claim 9, and submit that that claim is also in condition for allowance. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Please feel free to contact the undersigned should any questions arise with respect to this case that may be addressed by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 30, 2006

By: /Aseet Patel/
Aseet Patel
Registration No. 53,874
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001